Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/696,735	EROL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew W. Johns	2624
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) Andrew W. Johns, primary examiner.	(3)	
(2) Jason Lohr, applicant's representative.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 29 September 2008	Time: <u>1:30pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description: ☐ No		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 3, 22, 23, 29, 40, 58, 59, 66, 77 and 90		
Prior art documents discussed: None		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
/Andrew W. Johns/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	in Cimum if amonists
(лурисанглурисан в коргезена	те озднаше – и аругориате)

Application No. 10/696,735

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed. Examiner noted that a number of claims included terms that did not appear to have adequate antecedent support in the preceding claim language. Because the application was otherwise in condition for allowance, examiner proposed changing "the source document" at line 2 of claim 3, line 2 of claim 67 to fine 39 and lines 2-3 of claim 77 to read —the image file document—changing "the source document" at line 2 of claim 29, line 1 of claim 59 and lines 2-3 of claim 60 to read —the input image—; and changing "the source document" at line 2 of claim 29 and lines 2-3 of claim 66 to read —the symbolic presentation document—. Applicant's representative reviewed the proposed changes to the claim language and approved all the proposed changes. Applicant's representative also noted a typographical error in claim 23, where "recorded images documents" at lines 6-7 should read —recorded image documents—. Applicant's representative also noted that claim 58 was dependent from Itself. Examiner suggested that it might properly depend from claim 57. Applicant's representative eviewed the claims and agreed. Finally, applicant's representative verified that the missing application SN in paragraph [0004] in the specification was 10/660,952. Examiner will insert the as part of examiner's amendment to implement agreed upon changes to place application in condition for allowance.